



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/948,328	10/10/97	SIMPSON	D

020277
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
600 13TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3096

LM02/0429

EXAMINER

HOOSAIN, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2742

DATE MAILED:

04/29/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/948,328

Applicant(s)
Simpson et al.

Examiner
Allan Hoosain

Group Art Unit
2742



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/13/98, 2/19/98, 3/25/98, 3/11/99

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit:2742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-4,7,9,11-12,14-15,18-20,22-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Judson** (US Patent 5,572,643).

As to Claim 1,9,11-12,14,18-20, with respect to Figures 1-3, **Judson** teaches a computer system comprising:

a server, 14,16, coupled to the Internet (a data communication network), said server being programmed to execute advertisements and downloading sequences of program instructions for:

(a) obtaining advertisements (textual information) for forming messages for a plurality of subscribers, 12,

Art Unit:2742

(b) performing a significant portion of a text to speech process to convert the textual information of at least one of the messages to aural (speech synthesizer) instructions (Col. 6, lines 25-44), and

(c) transmitting the aural (speech synthesizer) instructions over the data communication network (Col. 6, lines 28-35);

and

a subscriber terminal, 12, for receiving the aural (speech synthesizer) instructions via the data communication network, said subscriber terminal, 12, comprising an inherent speech synthesizer for synthesizing an aural information object (speech waveform signal) representing the at least one message from the aural (speech synthesizer) instructions (Col. 6, lines 1-12 and 32-35).

As to Claims 2,22-23,25, in addition to the information above, **Judson** further teaches a computer system as in claim 1, wherein the server includes means for transmitting the aural (speech synthesizer) instructions over the Internet (a packet switched data network) (Col. 1, lines 59-67).

As to Claim 3, in addition to the information above, **Judson** further teaches a computer system as in claim 1, wherein the terminal further comprises a programmable central processing unit and an interface coupled to the programmable central processing unit for communication via the Internet (data network) (Figure 2).

Art Unit:2742

As to Claim 4,15, in addition to the information above, **Judson** further teaches a computer system as in claim 3, wherein the interface comprises a modem (Figure 3, label 50).

As to Claim 7, in addition to the information above, **Judson** further teaches a computer system as in Claim 1, further comprising an e-mail system for receiving e-mail messages for subscribers and supplying the e-mail messages as the textual information to the server for conversion and transmission to the subscriber terminal (Col. 6, lines 26-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was

Art Unit:2742

made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 5-6, 16-17, 21,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Judson** as applied to claims 4,15,19 above, and further in view of **Wolff et al.** (US Patent).

As to Claim 5-6,16-17,21,24, **Judson** teaches a computer system as in claim 4, wherein the modem comprises a network (Col. 4, lines 33-35). **Judson** does not teach a wireless network. One of ordinary skill would ask what kind of network **Judson's** invention could be used with. **Wolff et al.** teach a lap-top computer which communicates with a wireless network (Figure 1). Since **Judson** and **Wolff et al.** are in analogous network activities, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to add the wireless capability of **Wolff et al.'s** invention to the network capability of **Judson's** invention for a wireless data network modem.

5. Claims 8,10,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Judson** as applied to claims 1,7,12 above, and further in view of **Meske, Jr. et al.** (US Patent 5,530,852)

As to Claims 8,10,13, **Judson** further teaches a computer system as in claim 7, further comprising a WEB site server but not a news information server. One of ordinary skill practicing Judson's

Art Unit:2742

invention would be motivated to ask the question what are the various types of WEB page documents that can be obtained? **Meske, Jr. et al.** teach a server which processes news information documents (**Meske, Jr. et al.**, Col. 6, lines 1-51). Since **Judson and Meske, Jr. et al.** are in analogous document retrieving activities, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to add the news source capability of **Meske, Jr. et al.**'s invention to the document capability of Judson's invention for said server being programmed to execute sequences of program instructions for:

storing profile information regarding news topics of interest to individual subscribers;

receiving and storing news items from one or more sources;

comparing the stored news items to the stored profile information to identify news items of interest to each individual subscriber;

addressing mail messages containing text information representing the items of interest to subscribers mail boxes in the mail system; and

transmitting the mail messages containing text information representing the items of interest to the mail system (**Meske, Jr. et al.**, Col. 3, lines 45-68).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit:2742

Greco et al. (US Patent 5,568,540) teach a computer system for retrieving documents from packet networks.

Kuthyar et al. (US Patent 5,768,513) teach a multimedia system for performing messaging services over the Internet.

Gordon (US Patent 5,608,786) teaches a unified messaging system using the Internet.

7. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PR+OPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA.,
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit:2742

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Allan Hoosain** whose telephone number is (703) 305-4012. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Krista Zele**, can be reached on (703) 305-4701.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Allan Hoosain AA

Patent Examiner

April 26, 1999

FAN S. TSANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

